A DISCOURSE Concerning the WORSHIP of GOD Towards the Holy Table OR ALTAR.

Stephen Penton

LONDON:
Printed by *J.G.* to be sold by *James Good*, Bookseller in *Oxon:* 1682.

A

DISCOURSE

Concerning the

VERSION of the

Holy Table

into the

ALTAR.

A Treatiſe, ſhewing, That the Adoration or Worſhip of God in his Houſe towards the H. Table or Altar, is neither Idolatry, Superſtition, or Will-worſhip: but on the contrary agreeable to the Scriptures, and warranted by the Practice of the Saints in all Ages.

THey that go about to evince a Truth, and to demonſtrate unto the apprehenſions of ſuch as have ſtrongly oppoſed it before as an error, will find it a hard task, yea altogether impoſſible, unleſs he can firſt perſwade them to diſpoſſeſs themſelves of one Prin-

To remove prejudice.

ciple, which is uſually deeply rooted in the hearts of ſuch as are already prejudiced with an ill opinion of this Doctrine to be evinced: That is, becauſe they would not be thought to be ſo Impotent in Judgment, as ſo long to have believed and maintained an Error; or out of a ſelf-conceit, and opinion of their own infallibility, that whatſoever they have once held, muſt needs be Truth, reſolve abſolutely and unmovedly to defend it; never conſidering the connexion between the premiſſes and concluſion of their Adverſaries Arguments: or rather, what agreement the whole Argument hath with the concluſion which they have formerly hardened themſelves to defend unalterably: therefore I intreat the Reader, that he will for the time, at leaſt make himſelf a Third Perſon, and degage himſelf from both Opinions, as if he were Ignorant of both,

both, that ſo he may be a free and impartial Judge, not weighing how my Arguments comply with his private perſwaſion, but what neceſſary connexion there is between my Arguments and the Cauſe or Concluſion I have undertaken to prove; in handling whereof I will obſerve this Order. *The Order.*

1. *I will explain the Queſtion and ſtate it.*

2. *I will prove it.*

3. *I will clear it from all Objections and Aſperſions.*

But firſt, I will remove one Objection againſt the word [Altar] What have we to do with Altars? If Altars, we muſt have Prieſts, and Sacrifices too, for theſe are Correlates, and ſo we ſhall have Judaiſm up again. Obj. *from the word Altar.*

Reſp. I grant the Antecedent, but deny the Conſequent. An Altar, a Prieſthood, a Sacrifice, I grant; that this will infer Judaiſm, I deny. For thoſe Al- *Reſp. It doth not infer Judaiſm.*

tars, Prieſts, and Sacrifices, were but Typical ſhadows of the true ones; and therefore not ſo properly called, but in reference to the true ones; otherwiſe Chriſts offering himſelf was not a true and Real Sacrifice, nor he a true and Real Prieſt, nor his Croſs a true and real Altar: but this to be falſe is apparent by Scripture, *Hebr.* 7. The Apoſtle makes a diſtinction of a double Prieſthood, one Typical, the other Real; that after the Order of *Aaron*, this after the Order of *Melchiſedeck*: that to be aboliſhed, this to remain for ever: that had no perfection, this had: of this Order was our Saviour a Prieſt, ſo called for this very reaſon, becauſe he offered himſelf a Sacrifice for Sin; ſo *Corinth.* the 9th. and 10th. he plainly diſparageth the Sacrifices of the Law, and makes our Saviours the only true and proper Sacrifice. Therefore I invert

vert the Argument thus, we have an Altar, a Sacrifice and Prieſthood; *Ergo*, we aboliſh the Jewiſh Ceremonies, for they were not ſuch properly, but typically; theſe are ſo truly, as being the ſubſtance of thoſe Shadows. *Communion Service.*

Beſides, our Church, in the Prayer immediatlye before the Conſecration, calls our Saviours ſuffering on the Croſs, a full, perfect and ſufficient Sacrifice. And 1 *Cor.* 5. *Chriſt our Paſſover is Sacrificed*, &c. For he indeed is the true Paſchal Lamb, of which the other was but the Type; therefore the Church alſo calleth that Feaſt ſtill, and ever did, *Feſtum Paſchatis*, and not the Feaſt of the Reſurrection. 1 Cor. 5. 7. Pet. 2. 5.

Again, Alms, and Prayers, and Praiſes are Sacrifices, *Hebr.* 13. 16. Prayers, *Pſalm.* 141. 2. They are called the Calves of our Lips. And what more fre-

quent than the Sacrifice of Praiſe? Theſe are called Spirituall Sacrifices, in which reſpect we are called an Holy Prieſthood. This I ſpeak to vindicate the word, that it might not ſeem ſo odious, which the Holy-Ghoſt himſelf ſtill uſeth in the *New Teſtament.*

Obj. I grant that there are Spiritual Sacrifices and Prieſts, and Altars, *viz.* the Altars of Hearts, but what is all this to the Communion Table? Or though we allow Chriſt to be a Prieſt, and his offering himſelf, a true Sacrifice, and the Croſs a true Altar, yet why ſhould the Communion Table, the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, and the Miniſters of the Goſpel be called by theſe Names?

Reſp. By what I have before proved, it appears that theſe words do not neceſſarily infer Judaiſm, but the contrary, and ſo that part of the objection is ſatisfied.

To

To the other *Quæri* (what reaſon we have to call the Holy Table an Altar, Miniſters Prieſts, the Sacrament a Sacrifice) I anſwer, they are ſo, and ſo called in Scripture: and Ancient Fathers, and all Churches to this time, until ſome Muſhroom Novil Puritans ſprang up, that out of Ignorance and blind Zeal would have ſuppreſſed them. That they are ſo I prove thus. *Sacraments fitly called a Sacifice.*

If the Sacrifices of the Law and Paſchal Lamb were ſuch, and ſo called by reaſon of the reference they had to the true Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſs, not yet exhibited, then may the Sacramental Commemoration of this Sacrifice already exhibited, be much more fitly ſo called. The force of this Argument ſtands thus: If the Shadow may be called by the name of the Antitype, then much more may the true, real

and lively Commemoration of the thing it ſelf, already in act. Now Sacrifices were but ſo called, becauſe they were Shadows; the Sacrament is a true real, exhibition, and lively Commemoration of the Sacrifice it ſelf, and that by vertue of Chriſt's own words, *Do this, as oft as you do it in remembrance of me.* Do this, do what? *This ye have ſeen me do.* What's that? He took Bread, gave Thanks, brake it, ſaid, *this is my Body, Take, Eat*: He took Wine, poured it out, ſaid, *drink ye all of this, this is my Blood which is ſhed for many, for the Remiſſion of Sins, &c.* Mark it, what was the breaking of his Body in the Bread, the pouring out of his Blood in the Wine, was it not a Sacrifice? ſure it was, for it was for the Remiſſion of Sins. Now no Remiſſion without Blood, no Blood without a Sacrifice,

Sacrifice, ſo the Apoſtle argueth to the *Hebrews*. Again, he ſaith not which ſhall be, but which is broken and poured out, as already done, when as yet he was not Crucified: which argues that this Sacrament was inſtituted in memory of Chriſt's Sacrifice already done, though inſtituted before it was done. Again, do this in remembrance of me, Sacrificed for you, of me broken for you, of my Blood poured out for you, that is, of my Sacrifice for your ſins. For, for what elſe could our Saviour be remembred, or what elſe do the Elements repreſent or commemorate but that Sacrifice?

Thus then you ſee that as the old Jewiſh Sacrifices were Typical Sacrifices, ſo the Chriſtian Sacrament, is a memorative Sacrifice: And that one and the ſame thing might be both a Sacrament and a Sacrifice, none will

will deny that conſiders the Paſchal Lamb was both: Yet that was but a Typical Sacrifice, and a Typical Sacrament; this both a true Sacrifice and Sacrament. For although that Sacrifice of Chriſt on the Croſs, was performed once for all, yet the Commemoration of it was to be often iterated in the Church, till Chriſt's ſecond coming.

Again, why ſhould we not as well call it a Sacrifice in memory of Chriſt's, which it ſignifies, as a Sacrament in token of his which it Seals, or in token of a Covenant which it ratifies. The Scripture, I am ſure, no where calleth it by the name of Sacrament, for there is no ſuch word in the *Bible*. And therefore they that will have a Proof out of the Scripture for every thing they ſay, and give no reſpect to the Cuſtom and Language of the Church, muſt deſiſt

Sacrament. The word not found in the Bible.

'Tis a Seal to the Covenant, and therefore a Sacrifice.

deſiſt by their own principles from the uſe of this word; for they can have no Authority for it, but the conſtant and unanimous tradition of the Church.

Moreover, God never made Covenant with man, but with Sacrifice. For a Covenant ſince the fall, was always made for the redintegration of our peace with God, violated by ſin: Now there was no peace, that is, no Covenant renewed, where there was no firſt remiſſion of ſin paſt; and no remiſſion of ſin without ſatisfaction of Juſtice; no ſatisfaction without the blood of a Sacrifice, *viz.* Chriſt's Sacrifice. For that is the ground of our Covenant with God, and therefore whereſoever it is renewed, that Sacrifice is withall commemorated; in vertue whereof it was at firſt made, and ever ſince renewed.

Beſides,

Beſides, as in Sacrifices, God in token of Covenant and Attonement, with man, did as it were eat with him, and Feaſt him at his own Table (eating and drinking, having been always eſteemed tokens of Peace and Friendſhip) (For the Sacrifices were firſt preſented, and given up unto God, conſecrated unto him in Recognition of his Lordſhip over all Creatures, then afterwards Slaughtered and Offered, part whereof was conſumed, the other part was for the Sacrifice to Feaſt withal in token of Reconciliation with God) ſo alſo is the Sacrament a Fœderal Rite of our Addreſs unto God, to renew a Covenant. The Bread and Wine are firſt Conſecrated and made the Body and Blood of Chriſt, that is, a memorial of that Sacrifice which is the ground of our Covenant, and then are given as meat

meat from Gods Table, to be a Sacrament ſealing unto us his Reconciliation, in vertue of his Sons Sacrifice there commemorated. You ſee then, that this Sacrament is, how it is, and why it is a Sacrifice.

Holy Table may fitly be called an Altar.

Now if it be truly a Sacrifice, the Holy Table may fitly be called an Altar: For as the Croſs was the Altar of our Saviours Sacrifice corporally offered; ſo is the Table the Altar of his Sacrifice myſtically offered in the Supper. And as a Croſs did ſuit to his Body, ſo a Table to the Bread. As he did not inſtitute any Carnal Body and Blood to be the memory of his Sacrifice, but Bread and Wine; ſo he did not inſtitute a Croſs for an Altar, but that which was proportionable to the ſigns which he inſtituted. As in the Old Law, it was not neceſſary that the Type ſhould

in

in every thing be ſo Analogal, as to have a man Crucified for a Sacrifice, and a Croſs for an Altar, to repreſent the Sacrifice of Chriſt; but a Beaſt for the one, and a Table for the other: ſo neither is it neceſſary in the *New Teſtament*, the ſubſtantial Body of a Man ſhould be the ſign of Chriſt's Sacrifice, or a Croſs of an Altar for the memory thereof. And this I have the more fully enlarged, to anſwer thoſe, who will perchance confeſs our Saviours Croſs to have been an Altar, but not our Tables.

Table and Altar promiſcuouſly uſed.

Furthermore, what great material difference is there between an Altar and a Table, that we are ſo ſcrupelous? were not the Altars of the Old Law Tables? elſe what means the promiſcuous uſe of theſe words, *Ye offer polluted Bread upon mine Altar* (mark it) and ye ſay, *wherein*

Mal. 1.7.

wherein have we polluted thee? The anſwer of God by his Prophet, is in that ye ſay the Table of the Lord is contemptible. That which in the beginning of the Verſe is called an Altar, in the end is called a Table.

Obj. What's this but by little and little to bring in Popery underhand, when we begin to uſe their Language? for ſo Popery came in, and got head at firſt. *The word doth not infer Popery.*

Reſp. No ſuch matter, Let the Papiſt take away their Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation or Corporal preſence, and we ſhall not differ from them in the uſe of this word; for it is not theirs, but the Speech of the Scripture and the Primitive Church. The Papiſt may with as good reaſon ſay, that the Table is tranſubſtantiated into a Croſs, as the Bread into the Body. For if our Saviour by thoſe words

(*this*

(*This is my Body*) did mean to exhibit ſubſtantially that once offered Sacrifice, even that very Body Crucified, every time the Euchariſt ſhould be adminiſtred, and ſo to make it a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and Dead, then it is neceſſary that he ſhould mean alſo to turn the Table into the Croſs. For that was the real Altar of his real Sacrifice. And therefore if they will have the true Body and Blood, litterally underſtood to be then Crucified and Offered: I ſee not how they can avoid the inferring of a true Croſs, whereinto the Table muſt be likewiſe turned. For a Table was not the Altar of Chriſt's Bodily Sacrifice, but a Croſs. I know no reaſon why I ſhould imagine the ſame Indentical, Numerical, real bodily Sacrifice, and not the ſame Indentical, Numerical real Altar. The ſame Nume-

Numerical Sacrifice (ſay they) was offered on the Croſs; nay, his Cruſifying was his Sacrificing; but no Crucifying but on a Croſs: therefore if his Numerical Sacrificing be there, his Numerical Cruſifying is alſo there; if his Numerical Cruſifying, then his Numerical Croſs. Theſe things do neceſſarily reſult one from another, and all joyntly ſhew the abſurdity of the Popiſh Error.

But now, becauſe they mix falſhood with truth, ſhall we relinquiſh the truth? Becauſe they make the Sacrament a real Corporal Sacrifice, ſhall not we hold it to be a commemorative one, as Chriſt teacheth us? Becauſe they ſay in the Sacrament Chriſt is Bodily, ſhall we therefore deny that he is there really? So neither muſt we deny the Table to be an Altar, becauſe they hold Tranſubſtantion and ſay Maſs at it. For this is

to refuſe Gold becauſe of Droſs, Wheat becauſe of Tares, Corn becauſe of Chaff, which is mere folly.

The uſe of the word Altar in Scripture. Hebr. 13. 10.

But come we now to ſhew the uſe of theſe words out of Scripture. The Apoſtle ſaith expreſly we have an Altar, we under the Goſpel; for he makes an Antitheſis or Oppoſition between the legal Altars and this, in that thoſe who Miniſter at the Tabernacle, have not right to eat of things offered upon this. And why ſo? Becauſe while they retain the Ceremonical obſervances, now aboliſhed, they argue Chriſt the true Sacrifice not to be exhibited, and therefore have no right to eat of the Sacrifices of our Altar, which commemorate Chriſt already Sacrificed; or elſe I know no reaſon but the Jews ſhould have as much intereſt in Chriſt as the Gentiles, and be as much partakers of this Altar, would

would they believe in him as we do. But to wait at the Tabernacle, that is, to obſerve legal Rites, cannot conſiſt with our eating of Chriſt in the Sacrament, or participating of our Altar, becauſe the one makes Chriſt not come, the other commemorates him already come. That this is the meaning of the Apoſtle is evident, becauſe in the following verſes, he compares the Type with the Antitype, and ſhews how Chriſt did anſwer and fulfil all the Jewiſh Sacrifices, and inſtead thereof appoint his own, and conſequently aboliſh the former, together with the Miniſtery of the Jewiſh Prieſts, which the Apoſtle makes the reaſon of this Speech, *We have an Altar, whereof they have not right to eat, &c.*

Beſides, what other thing can be meant hereby, but the Communion-Table? For it is an *And that Altar is the Communion-Table.*

Altar from which ſome thing is eaten that was Sacrificed; for nothing was eaten on the Altar but what was offered to God in Sacrifice. But what other Altar can that be but the Holy-Table, whereat we eat the Lords Supper, aud commemorate his Sacrifice? You ſee by this then that the Holy-Table was thus called even by Saint *Paul.* If you ſay, he called it ſo improperly, and Anologically in reference to the Jewiſh Altars, This I have diſproved, in ſhewing that thoſe were rather improperly termed Altars and Sacrifices in reference to ours, whereof they were but Types.

Now having proved an Altar, by your own conſequence we muſt have a Sacrifice too, and a Prieſthood, for theſe you ſay infer one another as Correlates. But I will not be beholden to you to make this my Argument, but

but will prove out of Scripture, the word Sacrifice to be applied to our Sacrament.

The word Sacrifice to be applied in Scripture to our Sacrament.

God by his Prophet foretels the Jews, that whereas they had polluted his Altars, he had alſo rejected them and their Sacrifices, and would appoint himſelf a new People, and new Sacrifice. In every place (that is not in *Jeruſalem* only, and in one place) Incenſe ſhall be offered uuto his Name, and *Sacrificium Purum*, a pure Sacrifice or Offering, for ſo the word ſignifies in the *Hebrew*. Now what other Incenſe have we but Prayer? What other Sacrifice but the Lords Supper? Which he calls a pure Sacrifice or Offering, which God hath appointed to commemorate the Death and Sacrifice of his Son, inſtead of the Jewiſh Sacrifice which only Typified it. Matt. 1. 10.

This is the Interpretation of the moſt, and moſt Antient Fa-

thers. For among all the Antient Fathers both *Greek* and *Latin*, there is nothing more frequent than the uſe of theſe words Sacrifice, Prieſts, Altar, when they ſpeak of the Sacrament, Holy-Table, and the Miniſters of the Goſpel. No man can deny this, that hath but caſt his Eyes upon their Writings, who are every where full of theſe expreſſions. He that ſhall vilifie their Authority in this, let him give me better for the contrary, or I ſhall conclude him ignorant and impudent.

Add the conſtant uſe of theſe words in the Church even to this day, both of the Eaſtern Church of the *Greeks*, who have no Communion with the Church of *Rome*, and the Weſtern Churches beſides the Roman, *i. e.* the Reformed Lutheran Churches and our own, wherein theſe words were never out of uſe; but that of late

ſome

ſome Novelliſts who love to antiquate all things that are Antient, that their own modern intentions might be more in credit, have laboured to poſſeſs men with an ill opinion of them, by telling them they were Popiſh names, a ſimple reaſon. For if theſe names be therefore naught becauſe the Papiſts uſe them, then, ſeeing *a quatenus ad de omnis valet conſequentia* (as Logitians ſpeak) then all other names which the Papiſts uſe are naught, and we muſt not call the Lords Supper a Sacrament becauſe of them, nor Chriſten onr Children, *John*, *Thomas*, *Robert*, &c. becauſe they do ſo. Muſt we run from the Papiſts in every thing, becauſe they err in many things? This is to run from Senſe and Reaſon.

Thus have I ſhewed how the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is a Commemorative Sacrifice,

and the Holy Table an Altar? that it is ſo called in Scriptures, Fathers, and all Churches. Now why are the Miniſters of the Goſpel called Prieſts?

Prieſt the proper name of the Miniſter of the Goſpel. 1 Pet. 5. 1.

The word Prieſt (if we look to the Notation and Original of it) is the only proper word for the Miniſters of the Goſpel; for it is nothing but the contraction or corruption of the word Presbyter, which ſignifies an Elder. So that Prieſt and Elder is all one, and whereſoever we read the word Elder, we may as well read it Prieſt; as the Elders I exhort, that is, the Prieſts I exhort who am alſo a Prieſt. Now Chriſt would have the Miniſters of the Goſpel called Prieſts or Elders, not in reſpect of their Age, but in regard of their Function and Preheminence over the People, as being their Teachers and Inſtructors, in which reſpect alſo the People, though for their

Age

Age they may be Elder than the Prieſt; yet in regard of their ſubordination to him, are called Younger.

Miniſters of the proper name, of the Prieſts of the Law.

Again, as the word Prieſt is the term proper to the Miniſters of the Goſpel; ſo is the word Miniſter proper to thoſe whom we call Prieſts of the Law. For the word in the *Old Teſtament* which the Tranſlators were pleaſed to render Prieſt (not obſerving this notion which I have told you) doth not indeed ſignify any ſuch thing, though that alſo be a word of Dignity; כֹּהֵן which we tranſlate Prieſt, ſignifies one that Miniſters about Holy things, and therefore the *Greek* word ἱερεὺς and the *Latin ſacerdos* do more truly expreſs the meaning of that word, than our Engliſh Prieſt; for we ſhould rather render it a Holy Miniſter, or a Miniſter about Holy Things; or one that

that attends about holy ſervice;)
Neh. 10. 36. Eſay 61. 6. Jer. 33. 21. and therefore Scripture it ſelf gives this interpretation of their names in very many places. For though there were diverſe Offices in the Jewiſh Hierarchy, as the High-Prieſt, the Prieſts, the Levites, Nethemims, Porters, Singers, *&c.* yet were they all Miniſters about Holy Things, though ſome in a higher, others in a lower rank. For the Levites Miniſtred immediatly to the Prieſts, the Prieſts to the High Prieſt, and he immediatly to God: as in our Church, the Deacon (whoſe name ſignifies a Miniſter) Miniſters to the Prieſt, and the Prieſt immediatly to God. Therefore Prieſt, Levite, Nethemims, *&c.* are all ſum'd up in this name of Miniſters, ſee *Joel.* 1. 9. and 13. where they are all called Miniſters of the Altar. So *Joel* 2. *Ezech.* 46. 24, *&c.*

Ezr. 7. 24.

Thus

Thus you ſee what the *Hebrew* word ſignifies, which we turn Prieſt, and what the *Greek* word Prieſt ſignifies, which we would not have the Clergy called by, and yet it is the very word given them by the Holy Ghoſt, in the *New-Teſtament*, *viz.* Elders.

Now I pray, if they who waited on the Altar, were called Miniſters of God, or of the Sanctuary, or of the Holy Things, why may not we of the Goſpel be ſo called, that is, Prieſts, for that the Interpreters ment when they tranſlated the *Hebrew Cohen*? which word likewiſe ſignifies a Prince, to intimate the great Dignity of that Function which conſiſted in Miniſtring unto God about Holy Things. And of no leſs Dignity is the word Prieſt or Elder. And therefore theſe terms were premiſcuouſly given to the Jewiſh Clergy, and an Elder

The Dignity of the Prieſts.

Elder with them ſometimes ſignifies a Prince. So the Elders of the People, of the City, of the Congregation, ſignifies Rulers and Governours.

We are the Miniſters of God, not men: 2 Cor. 6. 4. 1 Cor. 4. 1. 2 Cor. 3. 6. Rom. 13. 6.

To be God's Miniſters is to be the Peoples Elders; for we are not the Miniſters of men, but of God, and ſo we are ſtiled, Miniſters of Chriſt, Miniſters of the Spirit, God and Chriſt ſet us on work, he ſends us forth, to him we Miniſter, though for you. When we adminiſter the Holy Word, the Sacraments, we are not therein your Miniſters, but his Diſpenſers or Stewards: For we do it, not at your appointment or command, or by your Authority, but by Gods, from whom we have our Calling and Commiſſion. As the King is not his Subjects Miniſter, though he doth adminiſter Juſtice to them, and therefore he is called Gods Miniſter. Angels likewiſe Miniſtring

niſtring Spirits to God, even then when they are ſent out for the good of them, who ſhall be Heirs of Salvation. For though the material Object of their Miniſtry, or that whereabout their Miniſtery is converſant, be men, yet the formal Object, or he in reference to whom this Miniſtery is executed, is God. Hence ye Prieſts, ye Miniſters of his that do his pleaſure; and he maketh his Miniſters a flame; and *Daniel*, ſaith of them thouſand thouſands Miniſtred unto them.

Pſal. 103. 21; 104. 4.

Thus you ſee then whoſe Miniſters we are, Gods, not mens. Secondly, What a Dignity this is, it is no leſs than what is attributed to Kings and Angels. You ſee likewiſe that what the Interpreters tranſlated Prieſts, ſignifies that which you call us, Miniſters, and the executing of their Office, Miniſtring or Miniſtration. As alſo that the

Dan. 1. 10.

Luk. 1. 23. the word Elder, that the Holy Ghoſt calls us by, is all one with the word Prieſt. And therefore if you be ſo much againſt the Jewiſh terms, you ſhould rather call us Prieſts than Miniſters: but indeed we are both, and the Holy Scripture uſeth both words promiſcuouſly, as well in the *Old* as the *New Teſtament*. For we are Elders in reſpect of the people, Miniſters in reſpect of God, and we Miniſter to God about Holy Things; unleſs you will ſay that our Goſpel is not ſo Holy as their Law, our Preaching as their Expounding, our Prayers, and Service, and Sacraments, wherein is the Body and Blood of our Saviour, are not as Holy as their Incenſe, Oblation and Sacrifice; for about theſe things are our Miniſters converſant.

Now I come to the main Queſtion, concerning Adoration

tion or Worſhip of God before, or towards the Altar, in our ingreſs into his houſe, or at any other time when we ſhall approach thereunto. Where firſt, I will ſhew you what is meant by Adoration or Worſhip, Secondly, what is meant by the Houſe of God,

1. By Worſhip, I do not underſtand here in the Latitude of the word, the whole Act of Religion, the whole Duty of Man, which ſometimes is generally ſo called, the Worſhip of God, the Fear of God, nor yet only or primarily the inward Reverence and Devotion of the heart, but in ſpecial, the outward expreſſion of Reverence and Humility in the poſture or geſture of the Body, not excluding, but implying the inward worſhiping of the mind. In this ſenſe the word is often taken in Holy Scripture, as in the ſecond Commandment, *What is meant by Worſhip.*

Thou

Gen. 24. 26. 48. 5. Rev. 19. 10.

Thou ſhalt not bow down to them, nor Worſhip them. So Saint *John* fell at the Angels feet to Worſhip him: but the Angel refuſeth it, and biddeth him worſhip God, that is, give the outward Worſhip that he was ready to do to him, to God, to whom alone it was due. For had not the outward Worſhip been an Act of Religion in regard of Saint *John*'s intention, and inward Reverence, the Angel needed not to have refuſed it; for outward Worſhip if it be only Civil, is ſuch as one man may give to another, a Subject to his Prince, much more to an Angel.

You ſee then the Holy Scripture by the name of Worſhip, doth oftentimes mean in ſpecial the outward Adoration of the Body in viſible geſtures; and ſo do I here. Now this Act of outward Worſhip, I make a part of Religion, which that you

you may the better conceive, I will tell you the Nature and Parts thereof: For it is not generally believed that outward Worſhip is due unto God, and conſequently that it is part of Religion.

Religion, the Nature and Parts.

Religion, which is derived from a word that ſignifies binding, Implies three things: 1. An Act of Duty. 2. The Object of that Act, God. 3. The Bond or Tye impoſed upon us for the performance of ſuch a Duty to ſuch an Object.

The Object of Religion is God, moſt Infinite, moſt Glorious, moſt Excellent and Perfect, and therefore our Act of Duty, in reference to ſuch an Object, ought to have three Properties:

3. Properties of it.

1. It muſt be an univerſal Act, or Act of the whole Man, Soul and Body, of all the Faculties of the Soul, and of all the Members of the Body. All are

1. Univerſal of Soul and Body.

to concur in this Act of Duty to God, and that for theſe Reaſons:

Firſt, Becauſe God is to be worſhipped by us as men; now, Men we are not without our Bodies; nor our Actions, the Actions of Men without our Bodies, *Actiones ſunt ſuppoſitorum*, ſay the Schools, Chriſt had not been true Man without a Body.

Secondly, Our Bodies as well as our Souls are Liable to rewards and puniſhments, and therefore with them muſt God be worſhipped, if we expect they ſhould be Bleſſed; and with them we ſhould be Damn'd, if we deny God's Worſhip by them.

Bond of Religion.

Thirdly, The common Bond which ties us to this Act of Duty to this Object, requireth outward Worſhip of the Body, which Bond is the right which God hath to require this Duty of us, which is grounded upon his

his abſolute Dominion and Sovereignty, and that is founded on his Communication of Eſſence or Being unto us. He made both Body and Soul, and wherefore, but that both ſhould ſerve him? Again, his continual preſervation of both, Entitles him to the Service of both; Laſtly, his Redeeming of both, multiplies his claim of Obedience and Worſhip of both. 2 Cor. 6. 20.

Fourthly, Our Saviour commands this univerſal Act, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy mind, with all thy Soul, and with all thy Strength. i. e.* with thy Body alſo, for there is ſtrength in that. Thus you ſee the Act of Religion muſt be an univerſal Act, and conſequently outward Worſhip and Reverence is comprehended under it. Mark 12. 30.

2. The Act of Religion muſt be the moſt excellent, moſt in- 2. *Intenſe,*

tenſe and perfect we can perform, ſo that all other Actions muſt be hereunto ſubordinate; For he is moſt excellent and perfect, and therefore deſerves our beſt performances. So that as he is to be worſhiped with all of man, ſo with the intenſeſt Devotion, Zeal and Reverence of that All: The whole Activity of all muſt be taken up in this Act of Duty or Service.

3. *Conſtant.* 3. It muſt be a conſtant, continued, uninterrupted Act, becauſe Gods Right and Dominion over us is conſtant and permanent. Not that we muſt always be converſant in every part of Divine Worſhip, always bowing the Body, always Praying, or praiſing with the Tongue, always hearing, always meditating of him in our hearts, always at Church: But ſo as all our Actions, whither we eat, or drink, ſleep or wake, talk, walk, work

work or play, ſhould be to his Glory, all ſhould tend to him as to the Center, all ordered and governed by his Will, all ſhould be ſubordinated unto Piety, and that always.

Thus I have ſhewn what Religion is, and that outward Worſhip is a part of it. Now I come to a more preciſe and ſpecial conſideration of outward Worſhip in it ſelf; And this is nothing elſe but an expreſſing and teſtifying of the mind. For though I do conſider theſe Acts of outward and inward Worſhip in the explication of them diſtinctly, yet I deny them to be ſeparated in the true uſe and practiſe: For the whole Act of Adoration, concretely taken, doth imply both; whence it is defined, a yielding of Honour to the thing worſhipped, by the Recognition of its Dignity and Excellency, and by a religious ſubmiſſion of Body and Soul, *viz.*

What outward Worſhip is.

The definition.

by inward motion of the Will, and outward teſtimonies and expreſſions of the Body.

The parts. Where note, three Acts concur to the compleat Act of Religious Worſhip. 1. The Act

1. *Eſtimation.* of the Underſtanding, whereby we apprehend the excellency of the thing we Worſhip: For the Will cannot incline it ſelf with a reverential eſteem towards that which the Underſtanding doth not firſt conceive excellent, and worthy ſuch reverence. 2. The

2. *Affection.* Act of the Will, which, upon the preceeding Act of the underſtanding, apprehending the Object excellent, doth inwardly incline it ſelf thereto, in its affections of Love and Reverence. 3. The Act of the Body, where-

3. *Outward expreſſion.* by we do by ſome outward tokens of reſpect and honour agnize the excellency thereof, which we conceive in our minds, and reverence in our hearts, by a ſubmiſſion of our wills thereto.

Both

Both which inward Acts are not only teſtified by the outward, but intended, encreaſed, and conſummated thereby.

All theſe three Acts muſt concur in one Worſhip or Veneration; For if the firſt be wanting, we ſhall Worſhip with the *Athenians*, an unknown God. If the ſecond, our Worſhip will be Hypocritical. If the third, it will be maimed and imperfect. Now this third and laſt Act of bodily Worſhip, which is the thing in Queſtion, being the Effect of the two former Acts, and the witneſs of them, is by a *Synechdoche* more eſpecially called Adoration. Of which there are reckoned up four ſpecies or ſorts: 1. *Nudatio Capitis*, uncovering the head. 2. *Geniculatio*, bowing of the knee. 3. *Incurvatio*, bowing of the body. 4. *Proſtratio*, Proſtration, or falling down. The firſt of theſe is proper only to the We-

Adoration and its kinds.
Nudatio.
Geniculatio.
Incurvatio.
Proſtratio.

ſtern part of the World, where the faſhion is to teſtify our Worſhip to any body by uncovering the head, (I ſpeak of men). In the Eaſtern Countrys they never were wont to bare their heads, nor is it the faſhion there to this day: But the other three have been always uſed in the Service of God, by Jews, Greeks, Chriſtians, and all Nations of the World.

Very frequently mentioned in Scripture. Gen. 24. 26. Exo. 4. 32. *and* 2. 27. *and* 34. 8. 2 Cor. 7. 8. *and* 29. 29. Eſay 44. 47. Dan. 3. 6. Job 1. 20. Matt. 2. 11. *and* 20. 26.

It is obſervable, you ſeldom read of Worſhipping in Holy Scripture, but there is ſome Geſture expreſſed with it, as bowing the head, falling down, bowing to the ground. The Jews in diriſion of our Saviour, could not mock a Worſhip, without expreſſing it by bowing, *Matth.* 28. 9. Did not Saint *Paul* Worſhip, when he bowed his knees to the Father of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*? *Eph.* 3. 14. And what is our Saviours reward now he ſits at the Right Hand

Hand of his Father, which the Holy Scripture expreſſeth by bowing the knee at his Name, is it not worſhipping him? that you may ſee how little, or no Worſhip, was uſed by the Saints of God in the *Old* or *New Teſtament* without external Adoration or Bowing, *Abrahams* Servant, the *Iſraelites*, *Jacob* their Father, *Moſes*, *Job*, *David*, Come let us Worſhip, and fall down and kneel, &c. (as if no worſhipping without theſe Demonſtrations). And the wiſe men, and the Leaper, and *Mary Magdalen*, and Saint *Paul*, all theſe could not worſhip without bowing, or kneeling, or ſome bodily teſtification of their inward Reverence, Submiſſion, and Humility.

Thus you ſee the meaning of the word Worſhip or Adoration, the neceſſity of it, being an Act of Religion, and the commendation of it, in that it

is

is the continual practiſe of God's Saints recorded in Scripture.

2. *Of the houſe of God.*

Come we now to conſider, what is meant by the houſe of God, by which I mean the Chriſtian Oratories and Churches, places devoted and ſet apart for the ſolemn and publick Worſhip of Almighty God. And firſt, I will ſhew the neceſſity of ſuch places, and then the Holineſs of them, which two things, many will hardly believe.

1. *The neceſſity of Churches proved.*

The neceſſity I prove, becauſe it is a principle in Nature; the very Common-Law of Nature did ever ſuggeſt unto men, that God was to have a place ſet apart in peculiar manner to his Worſhip. This I will demonſtrate firſt by reaſon, and then confirm it by example.

1. *By reaſon.*

1. I ſuppoſe none will deny, but that it is a main Principle in Nature, 1. That there is a God. 2. That he is to be worſhipped.

ſhipped. 3. That there muſt be ſome time ſet apart for his Worſhip. Now if we hold (as who doth not?) that it is part of the Moral Law, that God muſt have a diſtinct and peculiar time conſecrated and ſet apart for his Worſhip, which is the Effect of the fourth Commandment; it will then alſo follow, by the ſame Law of Nature, that he muſt have a place Sanctified unto him. Therefore the fourth Commandment doth (though not directly,) yet by neceſſary conſequence inforce and enjoyn a Holy-Place, as well as a Holy-day, or time: For time, and place are both alike neceſſary Circumſtances of Divine Worſhip: And he can no more be worſhipped without a place, than without a time; And therefore if the time ought to be conſecrate and ſolemn, ſo muſt the place likewiſe.

2. This

2. *By examples of the* Old Teſtament.

2. This may be confirmed from the example of God's Saints, approved by God himſelf from the beginning. Before ever there was a Tabernacle or Temple made by God's ſpecial appointment, *Noah* built an Altar ſo ſoon as he came out of the Ark, and there called upon God with Sacrifice. *Abraham* builds an Altar (that is a ſpecial place to invocate at) in the place where God appeared to him: and wherever he came in his Journeys, he ſtill erected an Altar, or place of Worſhip; and when ever he came into any of toſe places afterwards, there he ſtill worſhipped God at the place where he had formerly dedicated. The ſame I might ſhew of *Iſaac* and *Jacob*, who ſtill erected Altars in the place where they Pitched their Tents, and that without any ſpecial appointment of God. *Jacob* vowed a place for Divine Worſhip,

Gen. 8. 20. Gen. 12. 7.

c. 13. 4.

by

by the name of Gods houſe, where he would pay Tithes of all that God ſhould give him. Yea *Moſes*, before the Ark and that glorious Tabernacle were made, pitched a Tabernacle for the ſame purpoſe, without the Camp, whither every one that ſought the Lord, was to go; which he called the Tabernacle of the Congregation, or rather of Meeting, becauſe God meets with man there, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter.

Gen. 20. 22.

Ezek. 33. 7.

Thus you ſee men naturally were wont to accommodate the Worſhip of God from the beginning, with conſecrate places, as well as times: Yea, before the Law was given of any ſet or preciſe time; for that was not until the Decalogue was given by *Moſes*: Which argues, that Nature likewiſe had taught them that the work was honoured and dignified by the peculiarneſs of the place appointed for

for it: And that ſuch a place beſt beſeemed the Worſhip of God, the moſt peculiar and incommunicable Act.

Of the New Teſtament.

In the *New Teſtament* it is likewiſe apparent, that Chriſtians had their peculiar Oratories, and ſet places for their Aſſembling and Meeting to celebrate Gods Worſhip: For Saint *Paul* gives Rules of behaviour how to carry our ſelves in ſuch places, *Let the Women keep ſilence in the Church:* which that he underſtands not of the Company only gathered together, but of the place likewiſe where they were met; it is evident, becauſe he puts a diſtinction between this and other places: *If they will learn any thing, let them ask their Huſbands at home; for 'tis not permitted a Woman to ſpeak in the Church.* where you ſee he puts a plain difference between their own Houſes, and the places of publick

1 Cor. 14. 8.

publick meeting for God's Service, which he could not do, if there had been no such places. So likewise, *have ye not houses to eat and to drink in, or dispise ye the Church of God?* He chides them for their Irreverent receiving of the Lord's Supper, and puts a difference between their houses, and the places where they met for that purpose. 1 Cor. 11. 22.

Thus much to evince the necessity of Houses and Oratories for God's publick Service. Come we now to prove the Sanctity and Holiness of them, where we will consider, 1. What it is. 2. Where it is. 3. How long it is. *The Sanctity of Churches.*

1. There is a double Holiness, one Positive, the other Relative: The Positive is either essential, as God is, whose Holiness is his essence; or communicated, as is the Holiness of Saints and Angels, which consists *What this Holiness is.*

conſiſts in poſitive habits of Holineſs inherent in them, and imparted to them by God, the fountain of Holineſs. Relative Holineſs is ſo called, becauſe all ſuch Holineſs conſiſteth only in the Reference and Relation the things inveſted therewith, have to God, who is Holy, and to the Holy end whereunto they are deſtined. And this Holineſs was not only proper to men, but common to all other things that might be dedicated and conſecrated to God. In this ſenſe men are often called Holy, either in regard of their Function, or ſome State and Condition which puts them in peculiar relation unto God.

Relative.

Common to perſons and things.

In the firſt reſpect, three ſorts of people were called Holy, Kings, Prieſts, and Prophets: Who therefore were ſolemnly Conſecrated with Holy Oyl, and termed God's annointed. In the other reſpect, all the firſt born

born of men and beasts, all votaries, as *Nazarites*, were likewise Holy unto the Lord. Nor were men only thus Holy, but all other things that might be dedicated unto God, and were so, as all Places, Vessels, Garments, Times; all things, as Holy Oyl, Tithes, Incense, Sacrifices, Oblations, Vows, &c. which were in special order to God's Service, and thereto devoted; this is plain in the *Old Testament*.

Now this Holiness did not make the persons, or the things Holy, by any positive Inherent Holiness, by any Sanctifying Graces infused (for a man might be Holy in regard of his Function, and yet unholy in his life; witness *Hophny* and *Phineas*) but by reason of the Holy Object, and the Holy end and use whereunto they had relation. This latter Holiness we ascribe to Churches, and to all other things whatsoever given

to God, and ſet apart for his Service.

Churches are relatively Holy proved.

Now that Churches have this Holineſs, I prove, 1. That places in the *Old Teſtament*, dedicated to Gods Worſhip, were Holy, all will grant: For 'twas a received maxim among thoſe Antients, that a place conſecrated to God, did hallow the whole Country, and that the Land was unhallowed where there was no place ſet apart unto God. Witneſs the ſtory of the Altar built by *Gad* and *Reuben*, and the half Tribe upon the Banks of *Jordan*, which *Joſhuah* ſuppoſed they had built for this cauſe, leaſt the Lord of their poſſeſſion, being cut off from *Canaan* (where the Lord's Tabernacle was) by the River *Jordan*, ſo having no place conſecrated therein to the Worſhip of their God, might be an unclean and unhallowed Habitation. For ſo ſaith *Phineas*, and

Joſh. 22. 19.

the

the Princes of the other Tribes, ſent to diſwade them; *If the Land of your Poſſeſſion, be unclean,* &c.

2. God would have ſuch places to be reverenced. And therefore to ſhew he hath as much care of the place of his Worſhip, as of the time, being both equally Holy, he enjoyns them both together, *ye ſhall keep my Sabbaths, and reverence my Sanctuaries.* Levit. 19. 30.

That ſuch places under the Goſpel are Holy, proved.

It remains that I prove places under the Goſpel dedicated to God, to be likewiſe Holy, though not with ſuch legal Holineſs and obſervations whereby the Temple of the *Jews* was hallowed; yet with ſuch Holineſs as they might not be any ways prophaned or diverted to common uſes.

This I prove by our Saviours ſcourging out the Prophaners of the Temple, which that you may not think far fetched, and

from my purpose, consider, 1. What part of the Temple this was. 2. The reasons why he did so. 3. The time when.

What part of the Temple our Saviour cleansed.

1. It was neither the Inner-Temple, where the Priests alone came; nor the middle, where the *Jews* and Circumcised Proselites were permitted to bend; but the outward, which was common to all Nations that were σεβόμενοι, Worshippers of the God of *Israel*, though they did not tye themselves to legal observances. This third, the *Jews* scarce accounted sacred, the other two they did, and were so strict, that no uncircumcised person might enter into it, even at this time, when our Saviour exercised his Authority. And in this Court did they usually sell their Sheep and Oxen, at the Feast of the Passover, to such as came far off to Sacrifice, and could not conveniently bring them with them.

Dr. Parker's *defence against* J. O. *p.* 154.

You

You ſee our Saviour vindicates the prophanation of this outmoſt Temple: And this is farther manifeſt by the place of Scripture quoted by our Saviour, which otherwiſe would be impertinent: *My houſe ſhall be called a houſe of Prayer for all Nations; but ye have made it a den of Thieves.* Now no part of this houſe, was a houſe of Prayer for the Prieſts and *Jews*: This then was the Gentiles Oratory.

2. Why did our Saviour cleanſe this? Not becauſe it was a place of Legal Worſhip or Service, for ſo it was not; but becauſe, 1. It was a place dedicated to God, it was his houſe. 2. Becauſe it was a place deſtined to Prayer, a Holy and Religious Act. *2. The Reaſons*

3. Conſider the time, or rather times that our Saviour did this; It was not only once, but twice. The firſt time he went *The times.*

up to the Paſſover, when he began his Prophetical, Office; and the ſecond time he went up to the Paſſover to finiſh that, and to enter upon his Prieſtly Office, and to put an end to Jewiſh Ceremonies. How unſeaſonable had it been to vindicate the violation of Typical and Legal Sanctity, which within few days after he was utterly to aboliſh by his Croſs, unleſs he meant to leave his Church a laſting Leſſon, what reverence and Reſpect he would have accounted due to ſuch places as this was, which he thus vindicated. For we find not in all the Goſpel, any other example of vindictive Authority uſed by our Saviour, but only this, in freeing his Fathers houſe from Prophanation.

2. But if this Argument be not ſufficient, add here to what the Apoſtle ſaith, *He that defileth the Temple of God, him will*

God

God deſtroy. He ſpeaks indeed of the Bodies of Chriſtians, which are Temples of the *Holy Ghoſt*, or ſhould be: But the reaſon holds as well for other Material Temples, as well as their Bodies, which are ſo called Metaphorcally. For why will God deſtroy him that prophanes the Temple of his Body? Why, but becauſe God hath made it, and Conſecrated it to his own Uſe and Service; 'tis Gods Temple. If this be the reaſon, then it will hold for Churches likewiſe; for they are given and ſet apart for God, and for his alone uſe. They are his, not ours: and therefore to eſteem them as common, is to provoke God to deſtroy us, for ſuch our Sacrilegious Prophanation.

Laſtly, The Apoſtle, where he forbids thoſe things to be done in the Church, which may be done in private houſes, as for women to ſpeak, to be uncover-

ed, men to be covered, as alſo to eat there, their ordinary viands, and to do other ſuch common Actions, what doth he therein but argue the Sanctity of them, and their ſeparation from Prophane and Common uſes?

2. When this Holineſs begins.

If you ask when this Sanctity or Holineſs doth firſt begin to ſeparate ſuch places from common uſes: I anſwer, at what time they are at firſt dedicated: For from that time they ſtand in relation to God. This may appear from the ſtory of *Ananias* and *Saphyra*, who for purloyning part of that, which they had only in their hearts vowed unto God, were convicted of Sacriledge, and for example ſtruck dead immediately.

3. How long it laſts.

If you ask how long this Holineſs laſts upon them; I anſwer, ſo long as the Relation which makes them Holy remains

mains upon them; that is till God ſhall give up his Intereſt and Right in them. Not only while Divine Duties are exerciſed therein, but ſo long as the place is in order to ſuch Holy uſe. As a Prieſt doth not loſe his Relative Holineſs in regard of his Function, after he is come out of the Church, and there executed his Office; ſo neither doth the Church: For a Prieſt is even as Holy when he is out of the Church, and hath finiſhed his Miniſtery, as when he is in the execution thereof. And this to have been the Nature of all other Sacred things, to retain their Sanctity, as long as the Relation they have to God remained on them, I ſhall prove hereafter.

Having ſpoken of the Lawfulneſs of outward Worſhip in God's Houſe; I proceed to ſhew the Lawfulneſs of ſpecifying or determining this outward Worſhip

ſhip towards ſome place therein, more than others Secondly, I will prove the Lawfulneſs of determining our Worſhip towards this place, *viz.* the Altar, or Holy Table. The Lawfulneſs of both I will prove two ways; 1. Negatively, by proving them to be neither Idolatrous Worſhip, nor Superſtition, nor Will-Worſhip. 2. Affirmatively, by proving this Specification of our Worſhip to be conſonant to God's Word, and to the approved Practiſe of the Saints in all Ages.

1. *It is lawful to determine our Worſhip towards ſome place.*

Firſt. It is lawful to ſpecify or determine our Worſhip of God in his houſe, to ſome place. 1. Becauſe it is neceſſary man ſhould tender his Worſhip towards ſome place in ſpecial, it being a bodily Act, and he muſt look and bow one way, either to the right, or left; to the upper or lower end; unleſs he will turn round as he Worſhips, or look

look nine ways at once, that he might not be thought to adore the place he bows toward.

Secondly, As our Worſhip muſt be done towards ſome place in ſpecial, ſo it is lawful to do it towards one place rather than another. 1. There is no Idolatry in it; for unleſs we make the place the object of our Worſhip ſome ways, it is no Worſhip of an Idol: But we tender none of our Worſhip to the place. You may as well ſay we cannot look up to Heaven when we ſay our Prayers, but we muſt Worſhip the Heavens. Beſides, if to Worſhip God towards one place rather than another, be Idolatry, then *Daniel* when he Worſhipped God toword the Temple, and the *Jews* when they worſhipped toward the Altar and Ark, committed Idolatry. For if they could not Worſhip God toward one place more than nother, but they muſt worſhip

And to one place rather than another. which is no Idolatry.

Worſhip the place, Certainly God, who is Jealous of his Glory in point of Idolatry, would never have commanded or permitted it. What was then no Idolatry, cannot be now; for Idolatry is the ſame thing now and then, and the ſecond commandment did alike concern them and us.

No ſuperſtition.

And as there is no Idolatry, ſo there is no ſuperſtition in it: For we no ways circumſcribe God's Immenſity, or *omni preſence*, or confine it to a place hereby, no more than *Solomon* did, when he built a Temple for him; or God himſelf did circumſcribe himſelf, when he commanded a Tabernacle to be ſet up for him to dwell in. Neither was it in his heart, that men hereby ſhould have ſuch a conceit of him, as if he could be limited or contained in any place. Nor indeed had they any ſuch conceipt, for ſaith *Solomon*

lomon: The Heaven of Heavens is not able to contain thee, how much leſs the houſe that I have built? Now, if we do not imagine that God cannot be confined to any Church, why ſhould any dream that we confine him to ſome place in the Church more than another? Do you think God is confined in the Church, when you go out of your Houſes thither to worſhip him? would you think well of them that ſhould ſo judge of you? Why ſhould you then judge of us that we tye God to one place in the Church, becauſe we worſhip him toward one place rather than another?

Nor that it is Will-worſhip, I ſhall prove by ſhewing it conſonant to God's word, which thus I do: *Nor Will worſhip.*

That which is decent and orderly, is not only Conſonant to, but Commanded by Scripture. *But Conſonant to Gods word.*

ture. But to Specify our worſhip to one place is Decent and Orderly. *Ergo.* If the promiſcuous and in different Worſhip of God towards any place, left to every ones diſcretion, be indecent, and diſorderly, and a confuſion, then the determining of it to one place is Orderly and Decent. But &c. *Ergo.* For tell me, is there any Order where there is not Conformity, and Uniformity? Is there any Conformity or Uniformity that when Men come into the Church, one ſhould bow towards the Font, another toward the Pulpit, a third towards the Table, a fourth towards the Windows, one one way and another another? Surely this is not Conformity or Uniformity, and therefore not Decency; and therefore a breach of the Apoſtles command, and a diſorderly Service of the God of Order. If

any

any think this various worſhip Orderly, I ask, whether he thinks it would be orderly for one to come into the Church creeping, another going, another reeling, another dancing; one Covered, another bare? If not Order in this, neither in the other; for the Ground of Order is Uniformity: but there is no more Uniformity in ſuch Worſhip, than in ſuch coming into the Church.

Lawful to Adore towards the Altar, proved Negatively.

(2) It is Lawful to determine our worſhip toward the Altar, or Holy Table. That it is neither Idolatry nor Superſtition is apparent by what I ſaid before; for we neither tender any worſhip to the Table, nor Circumſcribe Gods preſence there. When a man pulls off his Hat at his coming into the Church, he may as well be ſaid to adore the Stones or Walls, and to Confine Gods preſence there; for he doth not come into his

own

own Houſe in that manner.

Affirmatively Rom. 12. 1. And that it is not will-worſhip, I prove, becauſe it is agreeable to the analogy of Faith, that requires our worſhip or ſervice ſhould be reaſonable, and ſuch is this. For if we adore, Neceſſity enforceth us to bow to ſome place; Decency requires to bow to one place, and Reaſon would that place ſhould be the that fitteſt place. Now the fitneſs of this place is to be judged by the Dignity and Excellency of it, and that is to be meaſured by the Degree of Relation it hath to God, and the Highneſs of the uſe, whereunto it is appointed. Now what part of all the Church, or what thing in the Church hath ſo near a Relation to God, as the Holy Table? or what is appointed for ſo high and Holy an Uſe as that? That which hath a nearer relation to God,

One place in the Church is more Holy then another.

and

& a higher uſe than other things, muſt needs participate of more External Sanctity, and Dignity than other things. Elſe you may ſay the Belfry is as Holy as the Pulpit, or Communion Table, and as excellent. But the H. Table hath nearer relation unto God, & is deſtined to an higher uſe than any other thing in the Church, *Ergo* it is more Holy & excellent, & conſequently the fitteſt place to tender our Devotions toward.

The H. Table more Holy then the reſt.

There is nothing likely to ſtand in competition with it, but the Pulpit, or the Font; but neither of theſe have ſo near a Relation or ſo high an uſe Firſt the Pulpits dignity proceeds from the Word of God therein read or preached; but Gods Spirit hath not made ſo near a Union between the word & it ſelf, as the Son of God hath done at the Sacrcement celebrated on the Altar.

Than the Pulpit.

As for the Font, True it is, the Scripture calls it the Laver foRegeneration, the New-birth, and that by the waſhing there-

Then the Fon

Baptiſme the Analogy of it

of we receive remiſſion of Sins. But the Analogy of that Sacrament is only thus, that as in our firſt birth, when we come out of our Mothers Womb, we are waſhed from the pollutions thereof with water; ſo in our ſecond, or new birth, they that were born into the Church, and made Members of the ſame, were waſhed from the pollutions of their Sins, by the Sanctifying of the Holy Spirit, who in Holy Scripture is frequently Signified under the name of Water. *John* 7. 38, 39.

Now though our bleſſed Saviours death and blood-ſhed be the ground of that Sacrament, yet it is not his Blood that is repreſented by the water, but the Sanctifying of the Holy Spirit; whence our Saviour ſaid to *Nicodemus Unleſs a man be born again of Water and of the Spirit.* &c

Beſides

Beſides Baptiſme is the Sacrament of our Initiation, the Lords Supper, of our Conformation; Baptiſme might be Adminiſtred to Infants; the Lords Supper, only to men of Ripe years. By Baptiſme we have only the beginning of our Spiritual Life; by the Lords Supper we have our Conſervation in it, and Continual food and nouriſhment; This is the Commemoration, Repreſentation Exhibition, and Application, of that one moſt perfect Sacrifice of our Lord, once offered upon the Croſs; So that upon this Table is prepared God's Heavenly Banquet for our Souls, our *Manna*, the Bread of Life, in Compariſon whereof, all Earthly Feaſts and Dainties are but poor, Courſe, and deſpicable. From hence we drink the Cup of Salvation, and Heavenly Benediction; yea, we eat and

drink the very Body and Blood of our Saviour in a Miſtery; Whence the Antient Fathers are wont to call them Reverend and Dreadful Myſteries, the Viands of Immortality, the earneſt of our Inheritance; and the place in Reference thereto, The Holy Altar, the Sacred Table, the Seat and Throne, and Chair of Eſtate of our Lord Chriſt Jeſus.

Thus I hope I have proved this Table to be the Higheſt and moſt Honourable part of the Church, and therefore the fitteſt, towards which our Devotions to God ſhould be tendred. Now I ſhall prove it to be Conſonant to Scripture, and approved by the Conſtant practice of the Saints in all Ages.

Perhaps you expect ſome place of Scripture containing this Propoſition in expreſs terms; But this Demand were unreaſonable;

unreaſonable; For if we ſhould believe no more than what we have expreſs words of Scripture for in the *New-Teſtament*, Then we ſhall be never able to prove our Baptizing of Infants, or our ſubſtituting the Lords day in place of the Jewiſh Sabbath, which are two points of main Conſequence; and yet we have no Rule given expreſly concerning them in the *New-Teſtament*: Nor was it needful; for in ſuch things where God hath not given, or preſcribed to us any new Rule to guide us, he hath refered us to the Analogy of the *Old*, This the Apoſtle teacheth us, where he proves the due of the Miniſters, miantainance under the Goſpel from the Analogy of the Old Law, *Do ye not know that they that Miniſter about Holy things live of the Holy things of the Temple, and they that waitat the Altar, are Partakers*

The Analogy of the H. T. a Rule in many things.

In Tithes.

1 Cor 9. 13.

takers of the Altar? even ſo hath the Lord Ordained that they that preach the Goſpel, would live of the Goſpel. But where hath God Ordained that, but in the Old Law, whence the Apoſtle proveth this? for what need God give a new Commandment concerning Tithes, in the *New-Teſtament*, while the Reaſon and Ground of the Commandement firſt given, doth as much concern us as them? It was reaſon that they who waited at the Altar, ſhould live of it: It is as much reaſon that they who Preach the Goſpel, ſhould live by it. God hath reſerved to himſelf the Tithes to beſtow upon his Miniſters, in the *Old-Teſtament*, for their maintainance; and it was not needful he ſhould give any new Command for Tithes under the Goſpel, ſeeing he never aboliſh't them; that he hath not aboliſh't them,

is

is plain, becauſe he hath not aboliſh't the cauſe for which he did at firſt Ordain them, *viz*, the mainitainance of his Miniſters, as the Apoſtle here ſhews. Thus you ſee the folly of thoſe, that will admit of no proofs out of the *Old-Teſtament*, for any thing, even there where is the ſame ground and reaſon which the Apoſtle confutes here by his own practice, and by citing a place out of *Deuteronomy* 25. 4. *Thou ſhalt not muzzel the mouth of the Oxe which treadeth out the Corn. which*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *God ſpake altogether for our ſakes that are Miniſters of the Goſpel.*

And whence aroſe the Auncient practiſe of the Church in Baptiſing Infants, but from the Analogy of Circumciſion? or the Hallowing of every firſt day in the week, as one in ſeven, but from the Analogy of the

Pedo Bapti- and the Lords day

Jewiſh Sabath? By the ſame reaſon it was not neceſſary for God or Chriſt in the Goſpel to give us any new rule for the manner of our worſhip of him in his houſe, or to ſpecify the place towards which we ſhould Adore him, in expreſs words, having therein left us to the Analogy of the Old Law, there being the ſame reaſon to tye us to worſhip God towards this place, that there was to tye the *Jews*, to worſhip him towards the Altar; I might alledge to this purpoſe a place out of *Clemens* (a man of the Apoſtolique age, and whoſe name, ſaith St. *Paul*, was written in the Book of Life) in his true and genuine Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* We p. 52. where he ſaith, ought to do all things right-ly, and orderly, which our Lord hath Commanded us to Celebrate, our oblations and Lyturgyes at appointed times; for he

Euſeb. line 3. *line* 14 *Ir. line line* 3. *line* 3.

he would not have theſe things done raſhly, and out of order, but at ſet times and hours. He hath likewiſe defined by his moſt High will, where and by whom he would have theſe things performed. But where I pray do we find any of theſe things Specified by God, unleſs he hath left us to the Analogy of the *Old-Teſtament?*

For the only reaſon that moved the *Jews* to worſhip toward the Ark was the Memorial of his Name, that is, of his Special preſence. The whole Temple was the Place of Gods Special Preſence, but the Ark was (as it were) his Front or Face, where he did moſt chiefly teſtify his Preſence, as the whole Chamber, where the King manifeſts himſelf to his Subjects, is called the Preſence Chamber, but the Chair of Eſtate doth moſt principally repreſent the Kings Perſon. But

The ſame Reaſon ties us to worſhip God towards the Altar, that tied the Jews to worſhip towards the Ark.

Simil.

But firſt I will ſhew that places in the *Old Teſtament*, ſet a part for Gods Worſhip, were places ſet a part for the Memorial of his Name, and therefore Sacred; and alſo that God did promiſe a ſpecial Exhibition of his preſence and bleſſings in thoſe places. This I prove out of *Exod.* 20. 24. where God, after the promulgation of the Decalogue, forbidding the People, by *Moſes*, to make with him gods of Silver and Gold, but that they make him an Altar of Earth (ſuch as their Condition then permitted, while they were journeying into the promiſed Land, afterwards of Stone) and thereon Sacrifice their burnt Offerings; he adds, *In all places where I Record my Name* (that is, where I cauſe the memorial, monument or remembrance of my Special preſence to be) *thither will I come to thee, and Bleſs thee.* The memorial or monument

ment of His Name is a Token or Symbole whereby he testifies his presence, Covenant and Commerce with man. Of these the Jews had two in special; First, the Altar with their Sacrifices on it, whereat God did often manifest himself by Consuming the Sacrifice, and was always present. For this promise, here spoken of, was made before ever the Ark was in being, or before there was any Command for making of it; And therefore before the Ark of the Testimony was made, they did Exhibit their Reverence and Worship towards the Altar. Afterwards, when the Ark was made, as a standing monument and memorial, they tendred their worship toward that, and the Altar joyntly; For the Ark was within the Vail, and the Altar befor the Vail, without: And that the Sacrifices upon the Altar was called likewise the Memorial Exod. 30. 6.

morial is apparent by the 2. 5. 6. and 24. Chapt. of *Leviticus*, But the cheif Memorial, after it was appointed and made by God, was the Ark of the Covenant or Testimony, which was therefore set within the Vail. (which by the way, Argues that things are capable of deffrent degrees of Relative holiness thereafter, as they shall have a nearer, or farther Relation to God; and participate a less, or more holy use; whence the destinction was of Holy, and most Holy in the Temple and Tabernacle) Again, so especial a memorial of God was the Ark, that it was called by Gods very Name. Hence the *Philistins*, when they heard that the Ark, was brought into the Camp of *Israel*, by the shouting of the People, they said, God is come into the Camp, meaning the Ark, which was the Symbole of Divine presence. But more epecially,

Things are Capable of different degrees of Relative Holiness.

1 Sam. 4. 7.

it

it is thrice called by the Name of *Jehovah*, where *David* is ſaid to dance before the Lord, before *Jehovah*, when yet it was but before the Ark. So likewiſe God is gone up with a ſhout, and the Lord with a ſound of a Trumpet, when the Ark was carried up out of the Land of the *Philiſtins*, and brought into the City of *David*, by *David*, with the ſhouting and the ſound of the Trumpet. *Phinehas* wife called it the Glory. i. e. The place of Gods Glorious preſence. The Glory is departed from *Iſrael*, for the Ark of God is taken.

2 Sam. 6. 5. 14. 21.

Pſal. 47. 6. 2 Sam. 6. 15.

1 Sam. 4. 22.

Now that God hath as eminent a Memorial of his Name among us in our Churches, as the Ark, I ſhall eaſily prove. For did not Chriſt ordain the Euchariſt to be a Memorial of his Name among us Chriſtians, when he ſaith, *This is my Body, do this in Rimembrance of me?*

Did

Did God ever say more to the *Jews*, to argue his special presence, either at their Altar or their Ark, then what our Saviour hath said of the Sacrament, *This is my Body, i.e.* My Person is mystically united to the Sacrament, and therefore Expresly calls it his Memorial. Why should not the places then appointed for the Station of this Memorial under the Gospel, have as great Sanctity as that, whereby Gods Name was recorded in the Law? What had the Jewish Memorial to make it Holy, which is not Comprehended, nay, excelled by the Christians? Is not Christs Body better than their *Manna*? Are not our Gospels better than their Tables? Ask Saint *Paul*, Who makes a comparison between the Law and the Gospel, and from the Excellency thereof, concludes the dignity of our Ministery above the Jewish, in as

Our Memorial more Eminent then their.

as much as they were Miniſters only of the Letter, we of the Spirit. Now what had the Ark to make it ſo Holy, more than the *Manna*, and the two Tables? and why then ſhould not our Goſpels, and our Sacrament placed on the Altar far ſurpaſs them, and dignify the Table above the Ark.

Our Sacrament, the Chriſtians Memorial is not preſent upon the Table, as *Manna*, and the Tables were in the Ark.

Our Memiral Obj. all is uos ever preſent upon the Alter.

Reſp. It is not neceſſary it ſhould be, it is ſufficient, they are wont to be there, and that the place is appropriated thereto. As the Chair of State loſeth not its Relation to the King, and reſpect is done to Him towards it; though he be abſent Moreover note, that the Ark of the Covenant was not then in *Jeruſalem*, when *Daniel* opened his window to pray thitherward, and that the ſacred Cabinet, with

with the things contained therein was wanting all the time of the Second Temple, inſtead whereof they made another to repreſent it.

You ſee then, that according to the Analogy of the *Old Teſtament*, we are as much bound to Adore God towards our Holy Table, as they toward their Altar or the Ark: The only reaſon, that they tendred their devotion that way, being, for that it was Gods Memorial or place of ſpecial preſence: And becauſe we have as Sacred a Memorial of Gods preſence and Covenant, as they had, we have the ſame, nay, greater reaſon to oblige us to Worſhip towards this place, this being far more holy than theirs.

Again, as God promiſed to meet the *Jews* at ſuch places, where he did record His Name, and there bleſs them. The ſame promiſe is made to us by our Saviour

Saviour, *Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there I will be in the midst of them.* Where take notice of a special presence; For Christ is every where, in Him we live, we move, and have our being; He is never from us, and therefore if there were not a promise of a special presence, what great matter had there been in our Saviours words? And to what purpose were that presence, but to meet with them and bless them? Now if Christ hath promised this in every place, where men are assembled in his Name, that is, to Praise and Glorify his Name in Publick, how much more in that place where his Name is perpetually recorded, and that by his own appointment? For a special promise of Gods blessing and meeting us when we call upon him, and bow to Him towards this place, doth not con- Math. 18. 22.

fine Gods bleſſing to the place no more than that promiſe to the *Jews*, did hinder Gods bleſſing them in the Houſe, and in the field, in their going out and coming in, which he promiſed, if they obeyed.

Deut; 28.

Or think you, when *David* ſaid, Hear the Voice of my Humble Petition when I cry unto thee, when I hold up my hands towards the Mercy Seat of thy Holy Temple, That he thought God could not, or would not hear him any where elſe? Or that *Solomon* thought God could not, or would not hear any prayer but what was made in his Temple? certainly he did not. For the reaſon why he beſeeched God to have reſpect unto the Place which he had made, and to hear the Prayers of thoſe that prayed in it, or towards it, was only this, becauſe it was built for the Memorial of Gods Name, for the

place

place of his ſpecial preſence, and God had promiſed to place his Name there. And mark Gods Anſwer, 2 *Chr.* 7. 14. *If my People ſhall humble themſelves and Pray*, &c. *Then will I hear and forgive. Now mine eyes ſhall be open and mine ears attent to the Prayers that are made in this place.* Would you know the reaſon why God would hear in this place rather than in another? (Though God did not abridge himſelf of hearing in any other place) It is expreſly ſet down in the next Verſe, *For now I have choſen and Sanctified this houſe, that my Name*, (that is my Memorial, or ſpecial preſence) *might be there for ever, and my Eyes and my Heart ſhall be there perpetually.* Is there not the ſame reaſon for Gods preſence in our Churches, as in their Temple? if they be as much Sanctified to this end, *viz.* Gods Memorial, or Name to In- 2 Chr. 7. 14.

habit in, as that was? And to what other end were theſe ever Conſecrated?

Now, unleſs you can ſhew this promiſe of Gods meeting and bleſſing men by a peculiar manner, in all places where he recorded his Name, was proper to the *Jews*, or hath been ſince reverſed by God, then certainly our Churches have as much of Gods ſpecial preſence as the Temple; And God will there meet with us, and bleſs us eſpecially; and we are to adore God as much towards our Memorial, as the *Jews* towards theirs.

Thus I have proved the Lawfulneſs of Adoration towards the Altar, out of Scripture. Now for the Opinion, and Pratiſe of the Church.

That it was the Opinion, and Practiſe of the Old Church, is apparent by what is ſaid *Hezekiah* in his diſtreſs went into the

1 Kings 8. 22.
2 Kings 19.14.
2 Chr. 7. 3.

the Temple, and their Prayed towards the Place of his presence, *Viz.* the Mercy Seat, and therefore compellates God by this Title, *Thou that dwellest between the Cherubims.* Might not the King have Prayed at home? was not God present in his house? or had he confined him between the Cherubims? No, but *Hezekiah* knew that God had more especially promised his Presence in this Place, and therefore here he comes, and prostrates himself before Gods Memorial.

How the Christians Esteemed ever and reverenced their Churches, *Vid. &c.* And how highly they regarded their Altars, *Chrisost. Hom.* 20. In the Second Epistle to the *Corinthians. Optatus* in his 6th. Book, describing the Dignity of the Altar, illustrates it from this, *Viz.* That it was the Seat of the Body and Blood of Christ,

Alexander, Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, falling down at the foot of the Altar, beſought God that he would ſubvert the furious Plots and Endeavours of the *Arrians*; the next day *Arrius*, as he was exonerating nature, withal voided his Guts and Bowels, *Nazians. Or.* p. 1. or in ſome 25. tells, That his Siſter *Gorgonia*, being Sick, applies her ſelf to the chief Phyſitian of all mortals, and caſting her ſelf down before the Altar, and Invocating him who was Honoured upon the ſame, ſhe recovered her former health. By which Examples, it may ſeem that God, by his miraculous benefits, hath confirmed this Reverence. *Tertull*, tells how penitents, after they are reſtored to the Church, at their entrance into it, were wont to caſt themſelves down before the Prieſts (from whom they were to receive abſolution) and to bow

bow themſelves ſubmiſly before the Altar of God, *&c.*

God cares not for any complements, He requires the Heart, and the Inward Devotion thereof, and ſo our Saviour teacheth us to ſerve God, *The hour cometh, and now is, that they that worſhip the Father, muſt worſhip him in Spirit and Truth.* *Object.* John. 4. 23.

This Text is much abuſed, to prove that God, in the Goſpel, allowsnot of External or Bodily worſhip or Service, but requires this of the Spirit only, and conſequently to make this the main difference between Gods worſhip under the *Old-Teſtament* and the *New.* Now, firſt, I will ſhew the abſurdity of this meaning which they give of the words, and then declare the true ſenſe.

The abſurdities of the Puritance expoſition.

This ſenſe is inconſequent from our Saviours Words; for he did not ſpeak any thing to the woman about Bodily worſhip, but only about the place of worſhip, and the Object. For her queſtion to our Saviour (perceiving him to be a Prophet) was about a main controverſy between the *Jews* and *Samaritans* (who were bitter Enemies) about the Place of worſhip; ſo whether Mount *Gerizim* or *Jeruſalem* were the place appointed for Gods worſhip? This you may ſee is nothing concerning the manner of worſhip, whether it ſhould be Outward or Inward. But our Saviour, in anſwering, waves the queſtion, and tells her, that was not ſo material a controverſy, but that there was a greater Queſtion than that about the place, *Viz.* about the object of their worſhip; for you, ſaith he, worſhip you know

They miſtake the Scope.

know not what, but we *Jews* know what we worſhip. After which, follows the words cited, *But the hour cometh*, &c. This is the firſt abſurdity, it hath not Conſiſtance with the conteſt.

Secondly, Their interpretation addeth to the very Letter of the Text; For our Saviour ſaith not, we muſt worſhip him in Spirit (only,) there is no ſuch word. This excluſive particle our Saviour uſeth not: So that though he might mean, that we muſt worſhip him cheifly, or Principally in Spirit, yet it follows not, but we might worſhip him with our bodies alſo Subordinately, for the Principal doth not exclude the Subordinate, but include it: And none dare ſay, that outward worſhip is oppoſite to inward. This is the Second Abſurdity; they add to the letter what our Saviour never ſaid or thought. *They add to the Letter.*

Thirdly, This Expoſition is directly

directly contrary to the words; For our Saviour ſaith, God muſt be worſhipped in Spirit and Truth; but God is not, nor yet can be worſhipped in Truth without Bodily worſhip; for his worſhip is not true, unleſs it be entire and Univerſal, as hath been ſhewen: and entire it is not, without the Joynt-worſhip of the Body.

'Tis contrary to the Doctrine and practiſe of Chriſt, and of all Chriſtians in all Ages.

Fourthly, This Expoſition contradicts the Ordinances of the Goſpel expreſly, together with the practiſe of our Saviour, his Apoſtles, and the Church in all Ages; For the bleſſed Sacraments are External Rites and Services. Baptiſme, wherein we make our firſt Stepulation with God, to become his Servants; The Euchariſt which is ſubſtituted in place of thoſe Bloody Sacrifices of the Law, to be a Rite and mean of our Addreſs; to Invocate and give thanks to his Father in the *New-Teſtament*

are'

are they not External Ceremonies and Services? Did not the Apoſtles, and the whole Church then, and the whole Church after them, ſupplicate God the Father by this Rite? They continued breaking of Bread (*i. e.* in the uſe of the Holy Sacrament) and Prayers: And Therefore in the Primitive Church, they uſed to ſay all the Service at the Altar, to Signify that they ſent up their prayers in the Name of him, whoſe Sacrifice, the Ground of all attonement and Interceſſion, was in that place Exhibited and Commemorated; yet it ſeems very Novel to us, to have part of our Service read there.

But leaſt you might ſay, the meaning is, not that God will have no External Service, but he will be worſhipped by no External Geſtures or Poſtures, I ſay this alſo contradicts our Saviours Practiſe, who himſelf lifted

lifted up his Sacred Eyes to Heaven; when he prayed for *Lazarus*, fell on his Face when he Prayed in his Agony, &c. What was Impoſition of hands, but an External geſture, when God was invoked by way of benediction? beſides, I ſee no reaſon, why, in the point of Evangelical worſhip, Geſture ſhould be more excepted againſt than Voice; Is not Confeſſing, Praying, Praiſing, an External Bodily worſhip, as well as that of Geſture? why then ſhould the one derogate from the worſhip of the Father in Spirit and Truth, and not the other? In a word, there never was yet in the World, any Society of men, that worſhpped the Father in ſuch a manner as this interpretation doth emply, and therefore this cannot be the meaning.

The true ſence

Our Saviour intends here to reprehend the Idolatrous worſhip of the *Samaritans*, who worſhipped

worſhpped they knew not what, *Viz.* God under the Repreſentation of a Dove, as the *Iſraelites* in *Jeroboams* time, and long after, under the ſimilitude of a Calfe. This was the Object of the *Samaritans* worſhip, as appears out of the writings of the Jewiſh Rabbies. This was their Idolatry, they worſhipped God in a Bodily ſhape; and the reaſon which our Saviour gives, ſeems to emply this; For God (ſaith he) is a Spirit, *i. e.* he hath no body, nor is he ſuch, therefore he muſt be worſhipped as a Spirit, for ſo indeed he is; and not by any bodily Repreſentatation.

The Samaritans *Idol.*

So that the ſenſe here is this, The hour cometh, and now is, that the true worſhippers ſhall Worſhip the Father in Spirit, (that is, conceiving of him no otherwiſe than in Spirit) and in Truth, that is, not under any Corporal

Corporal or Viſible ſhape; for thoſe that Worſhip under any Corporal ſimilitude, do indeed belye him: For the Apoſtle ſaith of ſuch, as changed the Glory of the Incorruptible God, into an Image made like to Corruptible man, they changed the truth of God into a lye. Hence Idols alſo are called Lyes, *Amos.* 6. 4.

Rom. 1.

Some interpret theſe words (the true worſhippers ſhall worſhip God in Spirit that is, no longer by Jewiſh Ceremonies, but in and by Chriſt, who is the ſubſtance of thoſe ſhadows. This ſence, though it be true, and plauſible, yet it is not congruous to our Saviours reaſon; *For God* (ſaith he) *is a Spirit, and muſt be,* &c. If this be the reaſon, then God ſhould never have been worſhipped with Jewiſh Ceremonies and Rites; for God was a Spirit from the beginning, and manifeſted himſelf ſo to be, even to the *Jews*, who worſhipped

Worſhipped him with Rites and Ceremonies. Therefore I adhere to my firſt ſenſe, Thus your main Fort is blown up.

The Second Objection drawn from Goos Proteſtation againſt Sacrifices, *Michel.* 6. 6,7,8. *Hoſ.* 6. 6. *Iſaiah* 1. *Pſalm* 51. with the Anſwer, *Vid.*

In a word, Religion, as man hath both a Body and Soul, the Soul of our Service is the Service of our Soul; but the Body of that Soul, is the Service of our Body; one muſt inform the other, and both make a compleat man of God. For as the Body without the Soul is dead, ſo the Soul without the Body is imperfect. God loves no maimed Sacrifice, God calls for the Heart, becauſe he knows it commands the whole Man, and therefore if he have the Heart at his devotion, he is ſure of the Body alſo.

Obj.

Obj. *Suppoſe all this, God is to be adored outwardly as well as inwardly; Yet this manner of Adoration is Dangerous, and may become many ways Evil. For,* 1. *It is Scandalous to weak brethren, who hereat are offended.* 2. *It may be an occaſion to ſome Ignorant Ones to Commit Idolatry, by Adoring the very Table.* 3. *It is a fair Introduction to Popiſh Superſtition.*

1. Every Scandal or offence taken, is not a Scandal given; Therefore that is properly called Scandalous, which in its own nature tends to give offence, not that which through willfulneſs or blindneſs, may, by accident, become ſuch.

Reſp. *Reſp.* Was not Chriſt himſelf a Scandal and Rock of offence? to the *Jews*, a Stumbling-block? to the *Greeks* fooliſhneſs? was not his Croſs a Scandal? ſhould not therefore Chriſt have come and been Crucified, becauſe this proved an occaſion of Scandal? but

but who are theſe weak Ones? and how is this an offence?

For the weak Ones, they are ſuch as uſually think themſelves ſtrongly grounded in the Faith, and able to confute this Worſhip we here maintain: Such as though they be Women and Weavers, think they can teach twenty of us thred-bare Schollers for all our Learning. Theſe are the weak Ones forſooth, weak I confeſs in their knowledge, for they are blind, and therefore the bolder; but in their own conceipt ſtrong enough. *Who are the weak.*

But how are theſe offended? Are they drawn to imitate us, in our Worſhip waveringly, and doubtingly, not knowing, (through the weakneſs of their Judgment) whether they ſin or no, but relying on the knowledge and conſcience of him whom they imitate, thereby enſnare their conſciences in ſin? *Why are they offended.* *Scandal.*

1 Cor. 8. This is properly a Scandal, as the Apoſtle ſhews expreſly, were he makes that a Scandal given, when in a thing in it ſelf indifferent, as Eating of meat Sacrificed to Idols, not as ſuch, but as bought in the Market by a man of knowledge; who knoweth that meat commendeth not to God, and takes no notice of the Idol to whom it was offered, but Eats is as Common, or Ordinary. When, I ſay, this Act of him that hath knowledge, doth occaſion one weak in knowledge, to Eat the ſame meat with conſcience of the Idol, grounding himſelf upon the example of him, whom he imitates, and ſo offends, Thus then comes in the Scandal. The ſtrong Eat of that without conſcience of the Idol, among the weak or ignorant that know not how to make ſuch a diſtinction; They imitate the ſtrongs example, as thinking what

what is lawful for the ſtrong, is lawful for them, and ſo Eat of it with conſcience of the Idol, or as devoted to an Idol, which is Idolatry. Thus the ſtrongs knowledge is an occaſion of Sandal to the weak, that is, it makes the weak offend in doing that without faith and knowledge, which the ſtrong do with faith and knowledge. But do theſe weak ones imitate us there in, and Worſhip God in this manner? They had rather run to *New-England*, than make a legg towards the Altar in the *Old*. How are they then offended? I'le tell you, they are vext at it, they Rail upon us for it, they Calumniate us for Idolaters, they Scoff at us as Superſtitious and Foppiſh, and thus they are offended.

Again, there is a great deal of difference between Adoreing God towards the moſt fitting place in his Houſe (which I have

already proved a neceſſary part of Divine Worſhip) and a thing indifferent, which in its own nature may prove a Scandal, as the Eating of meat Sacrificed to Idols, and the like. For then we ſhould do no part of Divine Worſhip, leaſt ſome ſhould imitate us to do it amiſs: We ſhould not come to the Lords Supper; becauſe ſome that are ignorant come thither only for faſhion, becauſe they ſee others do it, and underſtand not what it is, and wherefore: They think it lawful for them to do as their betters and wiſer do, and ſo they Eat unworthily and ignorantly, which others do worthily and in faith, and ſo offend in and by others knowledge. What then? Is the Sacrament and the Eating thereof a Scandal? No, what's the reaſon? becauſe in it ſelf, it tends not to make men offend by unworthy receiving. 2. It is no matter of indiffe-

rency

rency. 3. Becauſe thoſe that are ignorant and weak, are ſo wilfully, having means to be better inſtructed and informed. So is it in this caſe, this Worſhip of God, I have proved a thing Neceſſary, not Arbitrary. 2. In it ſelf it tends not to make any offend, either by Worſhipping the Table, or the place we worſhip towards: For then God ſhould have done all, in permitting and approving ſuch Worſhip amongſt the *Jews*, whom he would by no means put upon any occaſion of committing Idolatry, to which they were to prove of themſelves. 3. There are none but have means to be better inſtructed; therefore if any be offended, God forgive them, and ſend them more wit.

The Ignorant may be ſeduced or miſled to worſhip the Table, or place it ſelf, or to tye God to one place more than another. *The Ignorant may be ſeduced.*

Anſw.

Anſw. This Objection is partly anſwered in my diſcourſe of Scandal. Now I ſay, 1. A good and neceſſary Duty muſt not be omitted, becauſe ſome may make ill uſe of it. 2. 'Tis a thing very unlikely, that any ſhould think we Worſhip the Table, when we Bow before it, and ſo imitate us in that, any more than they ſhould think, when we put of our Hats coming into the Church, that we Adore the Stones or Walls.

It was the Ancient reproach of the Gentiles to the Chriſtians, that they worſhipped the Sun, becauſe they Adored God towards the Altar, which was ſet at the Eaſt end of their Churches: As alſo, that they Eat mans fleſh, and drank mans blood, becauſe they did Eat and Drink the Body and Blood of Chriſt in the Holy Sacrament. Should the Chriſtians have left of theſe Duties, becauſe

becauſe malice or ignorance might make ſuch conſtructions thereof? But what if it be granted, ſome ignorant men will Adore the Table? To what purpoſe ſerve we that are Miniſters, but to inſtruct them better, and to inform them how, and in what manner they ought to ſerve God both in Body and Soul? what elſe is our Errand? what the end of our Preaching? Is it not to teach men the difference between Good and Evil? Right and Wrong? and to do *Bonum vene*? Thoſe that may be ſeduced, are to be better inſtructed.

Obj. 3. *They tend to bring in Popery, and lead us unto other things that are Popiſh and Superſtitious.* *This opens a dore to Popery.*

Anſw. 1. There is not the leaſt Popery in this. 2. There is no juſt fear of bringing it in by this. 1. The Papiſts do not Adore God before the Altar, *Tis not Popiſh in it ſelf.*

but the Hoſt and Crucifix ſet upon the Altar, and make that the Immediate and formal Object of Adoration, *viz.* Their God Almighty in a Box, or piece of Wafer-Cake, which they ſay is the true Body and Blood of Chriſt. Moreover, when they Adore Images, they ſay, They do not Adore them, but thoſe whom the Images Repreſent, and put them in mind of. Now, they grant that they Adore the Image relatively, or tranſitively, though not ultimately or cheifly: and therefore they Worſhip the thing repreſented in and by, and with the Image. This I ſpeak, becauſe ſome ſay the Papiſts have as good excuſe for their worſhipping of Images, as we have for our Adoration before the Altar. Whereas we utterly diſclaim any kind of Worſhip to the Altar any ways, we make it no Object of our Worſhip either Relative or Tranſitive;

Image worſhip.

tive; We make it no Repreſentation of God, we Worſhip not God in it, nor by it, nor with it, but only towards and before it, becauſe it is the fitteſt place for us to tender our Service of God towards, being the place of his Memorial in a ſpecial manner, and conſequently of his preſence. We diſclaim all Popiſh deſtinctions, and in no wiſe make the Table the Object of our Worſhip: Nor herein is our Proteſtation contrary to our Action; for if the Action, in its own nature, were Idolatrous, it had been ſo in the *Jews*.

2. Neither doth it introduce Popery. For the *Lutherans*, who are bitter Enemies to the Papiſts, and the Papiſts to them, do obſerve this ſacred Rite: Nay, the Papiſts love and like us the worſe for it. For they baſely belying us, ſay, we Adore the Table, which they do not, but God who is upon it; and ſo accuſe

Not apt to Introduce it.

cuſe us of worſe Idolatry than we do them; as if we worſhipt a Table, and made that our God. But they Slaunderouſly and Malitiouſly traduce us againſt their own knowledge. To Idolize the Table, we abhor and deteſt, and no man of common ſenſe, except blinded with malice and prejudice, as they are, will believe them.

Vain fear begets the other extream.

You ſee how far this is from bringing in Popery. The truth is, this vain fear makes us to run into almoſt as great an abſurdity; for we are all for extreams. Becauſe men will not be Superſtitious with the Papiſts, therefore we muſt be Prophane, Sacrilegious and Irreverent with the Puritans. Becauſe the Papiſts Worſhip God falſely, therefore we muſt not Worſhip him after a true and due manner agreeing to his Word. Becauſe they Superſtitiouſly adorn their Churches, therefore we muſt

let

let them lye like Barns, Stables, nay, rather Sties. I am aſhamed to think that Chriſtians, People of worth and faſhion, ſhould eſteem the Church, though never ſo ſqualid, ugly and deformed, the Windows broke, the Roof untiled and Leaking, the Walls hung with Cobwebs, broken, patch't and ill-favoured, the Holy Table ſtanding like an Alehouſe Table, either with out a Carpet, or with ſuch a one, as a man would ſcarce wipe his ſhoes withall, a Scurvy, Lowſy, Moth-eaten tattered piece of Darnix, or other cloth: That men of worth ſhould eſteem this place handſome enough to ſerve God in, to Feaſt with God in, to be partakers of his Holy Supper in, who would think high ſcorn to be no better accomodated in their private Houſes and Parlours. Would they think theſe things handſome at home? how then can they

they think them handſome in Gods Houſe? I appeal to the Reader, whether many Gentlemens Kichens be not handſomer and better adorned than many Churches? I wonder what ſlovenly god theſe men fancy to themſelves, that can be contented to be no better accomodated in his Houſe, than with that which they themſelves in their own Houſes count ugly and unſeemly. If it were but for this one piece of ſlovenly Devotion, I ſhould love naſty Puritaniſme the worſe while I lived. I pray God amend ſuch horrible prophaneſs and abuſe.

Why we make Obeyſence when we come into the Church.

Why muſt we make courteſy when we come into the Church? can we not ſtay till we come to our Pews, and then fall down to our Prayers?

Why do we when we come into our Neighbors Houſe, before we ſpeak to him, put of our Hats, and then ſay by your leave?

or Gods

Gods peace be here? Why did our Saviour command his Diſciples when they entered into a Houſe to ſalute it? is it ſeemly and comely to ſalute a mans Houſe, when we come into it, and is it not much more ſeemly to expreſs Reverence and Obeyſance to God, when we ſes foot into his?

Obj. *But this will trouble my Devotions, diſtract my thoughts, and hinder my inward Reverence, while I am thinking of making a Leg or Courteſy.* *But it troubles my Devotion.*

Anſw. Tuſh, never fear it, I'le warrant you no ſuch matter. Is there ſo much art to be uſed in making a Leg or Courtify, that it muſt needs trouble your thoughts, and put out of your mind the inward Reverence and thought of God? This were ſtrange! Let me ask one Queſtion, doth Sighing and looking Sadly, and Weeping, hinder your Grief? Doth a merry countenance hinder your Joy? Doth

paleneſs

paleneſs and trembling hinder your fear? Do your outward ſigns of Love hinder the Love of your Heart? Nay, rather, Do not theſe outward Actions increaſe and perfect the inward paſſions, which ſhew forth themſelves in them? why then ſhould Reverence, which is likewiſe a Paſſion, being mixt of Love which looks at God as good; and fear which looks at his Greatneſs, why, I ſay, ſhould this be hindred by the outward bowing of the Body, more than any other paſſion? Nay, why ſhould it not rather perfect and increaſe it? Why ſhould it not make us think and ſay, how dreadful and Reverend is this place? this is ſurely none other but the Houſe of God, and Gate of Heaven.

Doth it diſtract the inward reſpect of Children to their Parents, to give them outward Reverence? to kneel to to them

and

and ask them bleſſing? Doth it not make them rather have an higher and greater eſteem of them? Why then ſhould it not be ſo between God our Heavenly Father and us? Nay, why ſhould it diſtract our Devotion more to bow to God when we come into the Church, than to kneel in our Pews? I ſee no reaſon of the one more than the other.

Were God to be ſeen with bodily eyes, or did he expreſs ſome viſible ſign of Glory, as he did to the *Jews*, ſometimes in a thick cloud, ſometimes in a ſhineing light, then we would all fall down with fear and Reverence, and why, but becauſe of Gods Preſence? who yet is no more in ſuch a ſymbole or ſign, than he is in our Churches. For God is not viſible, nor were it lawful for us to worſhip ſuch a ſign, but him whoſe preſence is manifeſted thereby; though we have

have no extraordinary ſign of his Preſence, yet as I have ſhewed, we have a ſtanding ſign and Memorial of his preſence, and he is as much to be ſeen in this as in that, for he is not viſible in either. Is it not then our want of faith, who are wholly immerſed and drowned in ſenſe, that we will not worſhip God unleſs we ſee him with our Eyes, or elſe ſome extraordinary Amazing ſign of Him?

Why bow to the Altar every time we come by it.

Obj. *Yet for all this, what needs ſo much Cringing, and Bowing, and Ducking, and Adoring when we come in, and when we come out, and and as oft as we come before the Holy Table?*

Anſw. Why do Parents bring up their Children and Servants to ſhew Reverence to them, as often as they come by them, or go in and out before them? Is there not as much reaſon that we ſhould be as obſervant of God our Maker and Redeemer,

in

in his Houſe, by giving him humble and dutiful worſhip towards the place of his Holineſs, Memorial and ſpecial preſence? I appeal to your ſelves, either it is Idleneſs in you to bring up your Children ſo, or no ſuperſtition in us to Reverence God in this manner, as oft as we come before him & approach near him. Whether you are more to be Reverenced by your Servants and Children, than God our Lord and Father by us his Servants and Children, ſpeak you.

Obj. *But why ſhould we do that which is not commanded neither in the Canons, nor the Rubrick.*

Shew it in the Canon *or* Rubrick.

Reſp. Why ſhould you rail at thoſe for doing of that which was never forbidden either in Canon, or *Rubrick*? But I anſwer, the Reaſon why this is omitted in our Liturgy is, becauſe at that time wheu that was compoſed and Reformed, our Church thought it ſuperſtitious, to make any ſuch injunction, becauſe it was then a

Although it be not Commanded any where, yet the 7th. Canon, *of thoſe made* 1640 *commends it to the practice of all good people.*

Catholick and received cuſtom ſo to do; and they did not think any Chriſtian would be ſo Reaſonleſs as to refuſe and diſlike it.

So likewiſe, there is no command of Organs in Cathedrals, for Anthems and Hymns, for the Rite of breaking the Bread and pouring out the Wine, when the Prieſt pronounceth the words of Conſecration, yet all theſe are, and ever were piouſly done and uſed in our Church, without any explicite command or Injunction of the Church; and are ſufficiently commanded by the alone force and Virtue of the Catholick cuſtom of the Church, which carries with it the force of an Implicite Law.

Beſides, that our Church doth allow, and in a manner command it, doth appear both in that this was never expunged out of divers Colledge Statutes, (which do expreſly enjoyn it) at that time when all our Statutes were

were purged and reformed, and alſo becauſe many Sacred Rites & Forms ſtill uſed at the Coronation of our Kings, and by the Statutes of the Kingdom preſcribed, do enjoyn this Adoration: for in them the King himſelf, as alſo the Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, is Commanded often humbly and lowly to adore God towards the Altar; and alſo may be further inferred from the preſcibed forms of Service for the Knights of the Garter, at the time of their Inſtallation, wherein they are enjoyned lowly and reverently to Adore God towards the Altar at leaſt Twenty times while the Sacred Solemnities are Magnificently tranſacted. To this add the conſtant practice of almoſt all our Cathedral Churches ever ſince our Reformation, which doth argue at leaſt an Implicite Command.

The Anciants Adored towards the East, *but why to the Altar?*

Obj. *If you ſtand ſo much upon Antiquity, the Ancients worſhipped*

God towards the Orient; and this Juſtin Martyr *in his Anſwer to* 118*th. Queſtion, affirmeth to have been a Tradition received from the very Apoſtles. Why then ſhould we tye our worſhip ſo much towards the Altar?*

Worſhipping towards the Eaſt. *Why*

Anſw. Then it follows that the Ancients did ſpecificate their worſhip towards one place, which is much ſcrupled at. But they worrſhipped towards the Orient, becauſe the Altar ſtood there, and ſo they tendred their worſhip to God towards both jointly, and therefore towards the Eaſt becauſe the H. Table ſtood there. Now the reaſons why the ſcite of the Churches were *Eaſt* and *Weſt*, and the *Eaſt* the upper End, were, both that herein they might differ from the *Jews*, and Ancient Heathen, who both worſhipped towards the *Weſt*, the *Jews* god, the Heathen gods Ape, the Devil: And alſo for other ends, as becauſe our Saviour, in whoſe name

name we Chriſtians worſhip the Father, is called the *Eaſt*, and the whole work of our Creation and Redemption was performed in the *Eaſt*, and many ſuch Reaſons they had why they ſhould make the upper end of their Churches towards the *Eaſt*.

Seeing then that the *Eaſt* was the uppper end, Reaſon taught them to Place that which was moſt Sacred and worthy in the uppermoſt place, as we our ſelves uſe to do with perſons, and things which we account moſt excellent and worthy. So they did not adore towards the Altar, becauſe it was ſet in the *Eaſt*, but therefore they adored towards the *Eaſt*, becauſe the Altar was placed there, as in the higheſt and worthieſt place. But in caſe ſome of the Churches were irregular, and ſtood not *Eaſt* and *Weſt*, yet they ſtill placed the Altar, in that

place

place which was accounted uppermoſt, and thitherward did tender their Devotions, even towards the Altar, whereever placed. And this is plain out of St. *Chriſoſtom's* and St. *Baſill's* Liturgies, yea, the Liturgies of all the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches and Fathers, which enjoyn Adoration towards the Altar wherever placed.

Conformiſts Looſe in their Lives.

Obj. *They that are ſo ceremonious, are commonly men that have no Religion in their Lives, but are all Outſides.*

Anſw. 'Tis no Argument, which is fetcht from the wickedneſs of the Perſon againſt the unlawfulneſs of the Action; for by this way of Reaſoning, to Adminiſter the Holy Sacrament, to give Alms, *&c.* ſhould be concluded evil Actions, becauſe wicked men oft do them. If the Action in it ſelf be not evil, 'tis no matter what the perſon is; indeed they that do a good Action ill,

to

to them it becomes Sin; as to give Alms to be ſeen of Men: ſo to give God outward worſhip is good, but he that gives it Him without inward worſhip, and ſubmiſſion of his will to His command, he plays the Hipocrite, and ſo his worſhip becomes ſin to him. Our Saviour forbids not his Diſciples to do that Righteouſneſs which the Phariſees did, but to do more to exceed it; Nor did he forbid them to make clean the Outſide, but he forbad them to content themſelves with that, and commands them to make the Inſide clean in the firſt place. Nor did he forbid men to do the leſs things of the Law, but commands them to be more careful of the Greater; not only to Tithe mint, but cheifly to Reſpect Righteouſneſs and Judgment. *Theſe ye ought to have done, and not leave the other undone.*

Beſides, the Objection ſpoken in General, of all that outward

Decorum

Decorum in Gods worſhip, is a falſe Slaunder; for there are a great number of Holy and Pious men which ſerve God entirely both with outward and inward worſhip; and there are many notorious Debauched livers that are not for outward worſhip. Our Saviour bids us Judge a Tree by the fruits; we can look no further than the outſide; If I ſee a man worſhip God, with his body, devoutly and reverently, I ſhall rather think and believe he worſhips God with his Soul too, then he that pretends only to inward worſhip, and affords me no outward mark or ſign of it. I ſhall rather judge that to be Gold which Gliſters, than that which doth not.

FINIS.